

**From:** [masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:masseybarb@aol.com)  
**To:** [Bill Shelor](#); [Ed Fuller](#); [Jennifer Smith](#); [Katie Maynard](#); [Robert Miller](#)  
**Cc:** [Deborah Lopez](#); [Andy Newkirk](#); [masseybarb@aol.com](mailto:masseybarb@aol.com)  
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Commission October 7, 2019 NZO meeting  
**Date:** Sunday, October 06, 2019 1:14:24 PM

---

Comments for Planning Commission October 7, 2019 NZO meeting

Chair and Commissioners,

I am sorry that two new subsections have been added to 17.38.050 because neither has much of a chance of limiting the use of cars or the need for parking.

Pg. 3, Transportation Demand Management, 17.38.050(C)(1) is a questionable means of reduction in this area. Transit accessibility doesn't mean it will be used. Many people run errands or shop at lunch or on the way home and need a car. There is more reliance in Goleta on cars because we don't have an adequate transit system. Both the routes and the hours of our transit system are very limited. Almost everyone has a car so having sufficient parking is important. This will only end up worsening the parking problem.

17.38.050(D) giving parking credits for new and redevelopment will only make an already horrible parking problem worse. This is the time to improve Old Town not continue substandard parking that hurts the entire community most especially the residents. Reductions in parking for Old Town Redevelopment is the wrong thing to do.

Attachment 2 Exhibit 1

Pg. 7, 17.30.070(B) and all following reference to the decision maker should be the Planning Commission not the Review Authority doing the review.

Pg. 12, 17.30.140(B) The buffer should be at 50 ft. not reduced to 25 ft. Coastal Sage Scrub is great habitat for a variety of wildlife and should be protected.

Pg. 13, 17.30.160(C) The buffer should be kept at 20 ft.

Pg. 14, 17.30.180(5) Only public interpretive signage should be permitted. There is no good reason for private signs.

Pg.15, 17.30.190(C)(1&2) Raptor buffer areas should have "when feasible" and "to the extent feasible" removed. Any mention of feasibility should only be included if a list of Required Findings is included.

I agree with Cecilia Brown's comments and strongly support requiring story poles. Too many projects have been approved because the decision makers couldn't visualize the impact of the project. Story poles are much needed.

Thank for considering my comments, Barbara